

FAX COPY RECEIVED
AUG 27 2001
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800In the application of:
Seres et al.

S.N.: 09/218308

Filed: 12/22/98

For: Protective Device for Printers

Box Fee
Assistant Commissioner of Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

A.U.: 2854

Examiner: Nguyen

FAX COPY RECEIVED

AUG 27 2001

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

#17 / Request
Recons.

8-30-01

L. Spennell

Certificate of Transmission under 37 CFR 1.8
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being
facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent
Office on 8/27/2001

Signature

Glenn L. Webb

Typed name of person signing Certificate

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Dear Sir:

The Applicant hereby requests that the outstanding Office Action be reconsidered
in view of the following remarks

Remarks

Claims 1 - 4, 6 - 14 and 16 - 22 have been canceled. New claims 23 - 47 have
been added. No new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Previously, claims 1-4, and 8 - 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being
unpatentable over each of the patents to Frick and Otsubo.. The Office Action stated that:

"Each of the patents to Frick and Otsubo teaches a protective device which renders obvious the structure as broadly claimed. Frick teaches a protective device 7 having a hood 8 covering a document feed path opening, and an access opening 11 that allows the document 12 to be fed out as shown in Fig. 1. Otsubo teaches a protective device having a hood 1a which covers the document feed path opening and an access opening 7 for providing access to the document 5 which is just printed from a print device as shown in Figs. 1-7 and 9 of Otsubo. *Each of the patents to Frick and Otsubo fail to clearly teach the protective device airborne particles.* However one of ordinary skill in the art would have used the protective device which reduces noise of Frick or Otsubo (soundproof protective device) for protecting dispensing devices or printers from airborne particles or dust or environmental contamination. With respect to claims 3